

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 22, 2003. Claims 1 to 9, 43 to 51, 67 and 68 remain in the application, of which Claims 1, 4, 7, 43, 45, 47, 49 and 67 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,878,401 (Joseph), Claims 43 to 48, 67 and 68 were rejected under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,009,412 (Storey), and Claims 3, 6, 9 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Joseph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns providing pay services (such as printing services) over a network. According to one aspect of the invention, an upper limit of an amount designated by a user to be paid for a designated pay service is detected, and a user interface is displayed to enable the user to select a desired one of the designated pay service and a pay service other than the designated pay service which can be provided within the upper limit of the amount to be paid. Thus, according to this aspect, a user can select the designated pay service and additional services that fit within the limit. In a related aspect, a plurality of additional services that need additional charges other than a basic charge for the basic service but can be provided within the upper limit of the charge are determined, and information of the plurality of additional services are output so that the user can be provided with both a designated basic service and at least one of the plurality of additional services as selected by the user.

With specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a method of providing pay services over a network, comprising the steps of detecting a request for a designated pay service, detecting an upper limit of an amount designated by a user to be paid for the designated pay service, and displaying a user interface to enable the user to select a desired one of the designated pay service and a pay service other than the designated pay service which can be provided within the upper limit of the amount to be paid.

Amended independent Claims 4, 7 and 49 are apparatus, memory medium, and apparatus (written in non-means-plus-function form) claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 4, 7 and 49. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of detecting an upper limit of an amount designated by a user to be paid for a designated pay service, and displaying a user interface to enable the user to select a desired one of the designated pay service and a pay service other than the designated pay service which can be provided within the upper limit of the amount to be paid.

Joseph merely discloses that a user inputs a shoe type and price range to search for inventoried shoes. If the input shoe type is not in stock, a list of alternative shoes that fall within the same class, related class, and price range are displayed. (See column 6, lines 4 to 23.) Thus, Joseph merely displays the selected shoe or an alternate shoe, and the user must chose one or the other. The user cannot, however, chose both the input shoe to be provided within the pay range and an alternate shoe as an additional item

that can be provided within the price range. Therefore, Joseph is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of detecting an upper limit of an amount designated by a user to be paid for a designated pay service, and displaying a user interface to enable the user to select a desired one of the designated pay service and a pay service other than the designated pay service which can be provided within the upper limit of the amount to be paid. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 4, 7 and 49 are not believed to be anticipated by, nor would they have been obvious over Joseph.

In another aspect of the invention along similar lines to the foregoing, amended independent Claim 43 is a service providing apparatus, comprising detecting means for detecting a basic service requested by a user and an upper limit of a charge entered by the user for provision of services, determining means for determining a plurality of additional services that need additional charges other than a basic charge for the basic service but can be provided within the upper limit of the charge, output means for outputting information of the plurality of additional services determined by the determining means, and providing means for providing the user with the basic service and at least one of the plurality of additional services as selected by the user.

Amended independent Claims 45, 47 and 67 are method, computer-readable medium, and apparatus (written in non-means-plus-function form) claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 43.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 43, 45, 47 and 67. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of determining a plurality of additional services that need additional charges other than a basic charge for the basic service but can be provided

within an upper limit of a charge entered by a user, outputting information of the determined plurality of additional services, and providing the user with a basic service and at least one of the plurality of additional services as selected by the user.

Storey is merely seen to disclose displaying an awards catalog such that, when a user makes an on-line purchase, they can redeem awards by viewing free (award) items that can be selected. Since the award items are free, they are not seen to correspond to additional items that need additional charges other than a basic charge for the basic service but can be provided within an upper limit of a charge entered by a user.


Accordingly, Storey is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 43, 45, 47 and 67.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

As a formal matter, Applicant requests that the Examiner provide an indication that the Replacement Sheet for Figure 6 filed with the Amendment dated August 26, 2003 has been approved.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 74329 v 1